EXHIBIT 5

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS V LLC; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

BIOGEN MA, INC.,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01993

Patent 8,399,514 B2

COMPLETE CAPTION ON PAGE 2

DEPOSITION OF CARA CHRISTANN LANSDEN

Wednesday, August 24th, 2016

9:50 a.m.

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, LLP
Two Seaport Lane
Boston, Massachusetts 02210

Reporter: Cheryll A. Kerr, RPR, SHR
Registered Professional Reporter
Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS V LLC;

HAYMAN CREDES MASTER FUND, LP;

HAYMAN ORANGE FUND SPC - PORTFOLIO A;

HAYMAN CAPITAL MASTER FUND, L.P.;

HAYMAN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.;

HAYMAN OFFSHORE MANAGEMENT, INC.;

HAYMAN INVESTMENTS, LLC;

NXN PARTNERS, LLC;

IP NAVIGATION GROUP, LLC;

J KYLE BASS, and ERICH SPANGENBERG,

Petitioners,

v.

BIOGEN MA, INC.,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01993
Patent 8,399,514 B2

APPEARANCES:

Carmichael IP, PLLC
BY: CAROL A. SPIEGEL, ESQ.
8000 Towers Crescent Drive, 13th Floor
Tysons Corner, VA 22182
(703) 646-9249
carol@carmichaelip.com
Counsel for Petitioners;

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett &

Dunner, LLP

BY: MICHAEL J. FLIBBERT, ESQ.

901 New York Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20001-4413

(202) 408-4000

michael.flibbert@finnegan.com

Counsel for Respondents

Also Present:
Carol Loeschorn, Biogen

INDEX

EXHIBITS

CARA CHRISTANN LANSDEN,
called as a witness, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE SHORTHAND REPORTER: Please state your full name and your address for the record.

THE WITNESS: Cara Christann Lansden.

My address is 145 Boardman Avenue, Melrose, Massachusetts 02176.

THE SHORTHAND REPORTER: Thank you. Please proceed.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. SPIEGEL:

Q. Okay. I'm with Carmichael IP Law Firm, and I will be asking you a series of questions here today.

I want you to answer them to the best of your ability. If there is something about the way I phrase a question that you don't understand, just say so, and I will try and rephrase it or restate it.

If you need a break, we can take one at any

58

exhibit. Okay?
A. (Nodding).
Q. The first bullet point says, "Dosing emerged as the most critical issue."
Was that what you remember as well?
A. I recall there was a lot of discussion on the different options which had different doses.
Q. Do you know why Option 2 appeared confusing to some CTRB members?
A. I do not recall.
Q. Do you know why commercial representatives were not in favor of a 240 milligram dose vis-a-vis the marketing strategy of a 720 milligrams dose under development for psoriasis?
A. No, because their favorite dose contained 480 mgs per day.
Q. Do you remember why regulatory representatives were concerned that bypassing a 240 million dose might raise questions with regulatory agency reviewers?
A. No, I do not recall.
Q. Do you know if and why research representatives felt that a true dose ranging study was only reflected in Option 3 or possibly adding a 120 milligram arm onto Option 1?

59

A. No, I do not recall. Long time ago.
Q. Was it within Dr. O'Neill's discretion to decide which doses were included in the Phase IIb study?
A. Could you define how you are saying "discretion"?
Q. Did he have a say-so? Was it his decision?
A. I would say it was not only his decision.
Q. Would the same be true for a Phase III study? It was not his -- it -- the -- the decision of which doses to be included in the Phase III study was not solely Dr. O'Neill's decision; is that correct?
A. I think that there is a difference in Phase II and Phase III in how study design is approached, so is it solely Dr. O'Neill's decision?
No, but I would also say that he has more of an influence in Phase III on that front than he would in a -- in this Phase II.
Q. So would it be fair to say that the ultimate dose selection was subject to approval by the CTRB and other management at Biogen, then?
MR. FLIBBERT: Objection to form.
BY MS. SPIEGEL:

60

Q. Was dose selection subject to approval by the CTRB and other management at Biogen?
MR. FLIBBERT: Same objection.
(Pause)
BY MS. SPIEGEL:
Q. Did the CTRB and other management at Biogen have the final decision as to which doses were to be included in clinical trials for MS?
A. I don't know who made those decisions --
Q. Okay.
A. -- or who had the authority to make all of those decisions.
Q. In the fourth bullet point, it says, "BID dosing was discussed, and it was thought that this dosing regimen was beneficial on many different levels."
Do you remember any of the beneficial aspects of BID dosing that was discussed?
A. No, I do not.
Q. So despite the fact that BID dosing was discussed and thought beneficial, there was no BID dosing included in the Phase IIb study, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And Option 3 was ultimately approved for the Phase IIb study; is that correct?

61

A. That is correct.
Q. And Option 3 did not include a 480 milligrams per day dosing arm; is that correct?
A. That is correct. It was not in Option 3.
Q. Were --
Do you know if any of the patients were given a dose of 480 milligrams per day as part of the Phase IIb study?
A. Not per protocol.
Q. Okay. In other words, BG --
MS. SPIEGEL: Strike that.
BY MS. SPIEGEL:
Q. In other words, Biogen never drafted a Phase IIb protocol that included patients receiving 480 milligrams per day, did it?
A. It was not the C-1900 study that would include a 480 mg per day dose in their Phase IIb.
Q. So Biogen chose to prioritize testing a 720 milligrams per day dosage over a 480 milligram per day dosage in Phase IIb study, correct?
A. I would not phrase it as "prioritize."
There was no indication or discussion of prioritizing 720 mgs per day.
Q. Nonetheless, the Phase IIb study contained a 720 milligram per day dosing arm and did

98

trial?
A. Could you be specific by what you mean by "approved"?
Q. It was the final clinical protocol.
A. The -- I don't think I was on the team when the final clinical protocol was approved, so I don't think I can speak to that.
Q. Okay.
In paragraph 52 of your declaration, you stated that you were "Still exposed to information related to BG-12 after you left the BG-12 program in July 2006."
When did you stop receiving information about BG-12?
A. General information that all program managers -- clinical program managers -- received on distribution lists I would continue to get, and they would have general status type of updates for BG-12.
So for as long as I was a program manager, there was general information about BG-12 that I was copied on.
Q. So that would include up to the time that you left Biogen in 2013?
A. No. I was not a program manager --
Q. So would --

99

A. -- for all of that time.
(Pause)
THE WITNESS: 2007.
BY MS. SPIEGEL:
Q. 2007?
Well, in 2007, you changed from a program lead to a senior manager of clinical operations, so that would be --
A. Changing into the line management role.
Q. So that's when you stopped receiving information on BG-12?
A. That's when I stopped receiving regular information that all program managers would receive on BG-12.
I would still hear some information on BG-12 in general meetings where they did status updates or from people on my -- who reported to me that worked on the BG-12 studies.
Q. But you didn't receive formal communications, internal memos or --
A. No. I would not.
Q. It was just chat?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I have two last questions.
A. Okay.

100

Q. At any time during the breaks today, did you discuss your testimony with counsel?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Did you overhear any discussions concerning your testimony?
A. No, I did not.
MS. SPIEGEL: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.
MR. FLIBBERT: I have no questions. Thank you.
(Thereupon, the deposition was concluded at 1:52 p.m.)
(The exhibits were retained by the shorthand reporter to be attached to the transcript.)

101

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
I, Cheryll Kerr, a Registered Realtime Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the officer before whom the proceedings were taken, hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of these proceedings; that said proceedings were taken in stenotype by me on the 24th day of August 2016, commencing at 9:50 a.m., ending at 1:52 p.m.
I further certify that present on behalf of Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC, et al. was Carol A. Spiegel, Esq., of Carmichael IP, PLLC; and on behalf of Biogen MA Inc. was Michael J. Flibbert, Esq., of Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP.
I further certify that I am not related to, nor associated with any of the parties or their attorneys, nor do I have any disqualifying interest, personal or financial, in the actions within.
Signed this 24th day of August 2016, at Suffolk County, Massachusetts.

_____
Cheryll Kerr, RPR, SHR
My commission expires: December 20, 2020

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT

I, _____, do hereby acknowledge that I have read and examined the foregoing testimony, and the same is a true, correct and complete transcription of the testimony given by me, and any corrections appear on the attached Errata Sheet signed by me.

_____ _____

(DATE) (SIGNATURE)

ERRATA SHEET FOR THE TRANSCRIPT OF:

Caption: Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC, et al. v. Biogen MA Inc.
Deponent: Cara Christann Lansden
Dep. Date: August 24, 2016

I wish to make the following changes for the following reasons:

Pg.	Ln.	Now Reads	Should Read	Reasons Therefore
Please see attached sheet.				

SIGNATURE OF THE WITNESS

this 15 day of SEPTEMBER, 2016.

ATTACHMENT TO THE ERRATA SHEET FOR THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE DEPOSITION OF CARA C. LANSDEN, AUGUST 24, 2016

I wish to make the following changes for the following reasons:

Pg.	Ln.	Now Reads	Should Read	Reasons Therefore
35	10	BID daily	TID daily	typographical error
35	16	BIG per day	BID per day	typographical error
36	9	BID 12 per day	BG-12 per day	typographical error
39	12-13	that the we	that we	typographical error
43	10	for me	from me	typographical error
55	20	phase to be	Phase 2b	typographical error
63	1	BIG	Biogen	typographical error
65	12	BG	BG-12	typographical error
66	8	labs' feasbility	labs, feasibility	typographical error
68	12-13	were provided with updates to the BG CDT	provided updates to the BG-12 CDT	typographical error
71	18	different endpoints,	Different endpoints:	typographical error
82	25	listed on	listed in	typographical error
84	3-4	active placebo in reference	active, placebo and reference	typographical error
84	6	active placebo	active, placebo	typographical error
84	8	That's the ones	Those are the ones	typographical error
84	8-9	that were the way	that was the way	typographical error
86	17-18	was copy	was copied	typographical error
89	1	of	on	typographical error
90	20	109-MS	109-MS-301	typographical error
96	3	the	then	typographical error

15 SEP 2016

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT

I, CARA C. LANSDEN, do hereby acknowledge that I have read and examined the foregoing testimony, and the same is a true, correct and complete transcription of the testimony given by me, and any corrections appear on the attached Errata Sheet signed by me.

15SEP2016 (DATE)

(SIGNATURE)